## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

INGE T. ANDERSON,

Plaintiff,

NO. C17-0891RSL

v.

**ORDER** 

SCOTT ALAN ANDERSON,

Defendant.

On June 20, 2019, the Court resolved plaintiff's unopposed requests for sanctions (Dkt. # 109 and Dkt. # 112). The Court found that, although entry of judgment against defendant for failing to comply with the disclosure and conference requirements of LCR 16 would be too harsh a sanction, an exclusionary order was essential to the fair resolution of this matter. The Court therefore ordered that (a) defendant will be permitted to call as witnesses only himself and plaintiff and (b) the only exhibits defendant may utilize at trial are those listed by plaintiff in her pretrial statement or offered only for impeachment purposes.

Five days later, defendant filed an untimely "response" to one of plaintiff's requests for sanctions. Dkt. # 121. Because the sanctions issue has already been resolved, the Court assumes

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The response specifically states, "Defendant responds as follows to [plaintiff's] request for sanctions raised in her motions in limine." Dkt. # 121 at 1. The deadline for responding to plaintiff's combined motion in limine/motion for sanctions was June 12, 2019. The deadline for responding to the sanctions portion of the motion for temporary restraining order was noon on June 19, 2019.

defendant is seeking reconsideration of the exclusionary ruling. He has not, however, set forth the appropriate standard for such a motion, nor has he shown manifest error or new facts or law that could not have been timely presented for the Court's consideration. Reconsideration is therefore DENIED, but the Court takes under advisement the issue of whether defendant may present evidence regarding the state court proceedings that occurred after discovery closed and the pretrial order was submitted.

Dated this 26th day of June, 2019.

Robert S. Lasnik

MMS Casnik

United States District Judge